- 1 -

REPLY TO WRITTEN OPINION

To: Kenichi ISHI, Examiner of the Patent Office

- Identification of International Application PCT/JP03/13218
- 2. Applicant

Name: MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.

Address: 1006, Oaza Kadoma, Kadoma-shi,

Osaka 571-8501 Japan

Country of nationality: Japan Country of residence: Japan

3. Agent

Name: (7828) YAMAMOTO Shusaku

Address: Fifteenth Floor, Crystal Tower, 2-27, Shiromi

1-chome, Chuo-ku, Osaka-shi,

Osaka-shi, Osaka 540-6015 Japan

4. Date of Notification: 16.03.04

5. Subject Matter of Argument

The gist of the subject application is as described in the claims as amended by Amendments filed on the same date as this reply.

Pending claims 1 thorough 51 are cancelled and new claims 52 through 98 are defined.

The correspondence between the claims as amended (hereinafter, new claims) and the claims before amendment

Rest Available Copy

- 2 -

(hereinafter, old claims) is as follows.

New claims	Old claims	New claims	Old claims
52	1+4+8	76	6
53	16	77	7
54	17	78	9
55	18	79	10
56	19	80	11
57	20	81	12
58	21	82	13
59	40	83	14
60	41	84	15
61	42	85	26
62	43	86	27
63	44	87	28
64	45	88	31
65	22	89	32
66	23	90	33
67	24	91	34
68	25	92	37
69	46	93	38
70	47	94	1+26+29
71	48	95	1+26+30
72	49	96	1+33+35
73	50	97	1+33+36
74	51	98	1+33+39
75	5 .		

Old claims 2 and 3 are cancelled.

New claim 52 has both novelty and an inventive step. New claim 52 defines outputting the second packet stored in the second queue means such that an amount of the second

Best Available Copy

- 3 -

packet stored in the second queue means does not exceeds a predetermined amount. As mentioned above, this feature corresponds to old claim 8. In the Written Opinion, old claim 8 is recognized to have novelty and an inventive step.

The Written Opinion says that any of the document does not recite nor suggest outputting preferentially from a first queue when an amount stored in the second queue does not exceeds a predetermined amount, and outputting preferentially from a second queue when an amount stored in the second queue exceeds a predetermined amount.

New claim 94 has both novelty and an inventive step. As mentioned above, new claim 94 corresponds to old claim 29. In the Written Opinion, old claim 29 is recognized to have novelty and an inventive step.

The Written Opinion says that any of the documents does not recite nor suggest performing authentification based on a propagation delay time of one-way or a round trip for packets.

New claim 95 has both novelty and an inventive step. As mentioned above, new claim 95 corresponds to old claim 30. In the Written Opinion, old claim 30 is recognized to have novelty and an inventive step.

The Written Opinion says that any of the documents does not recite nor suggest performing authentification based on whether it is in a mode for scrambling and transmitting.

New claim 96 has both novelty and an inventive step. As mentioned above, new claim 96 corresponds to old claim

Rest Available Copy

- 4 .

35. In the Written Opinion, old claim 35 is recognized to have novelty and an inventive step.

The Written Opinion says that any of the documents does not recite nor suggest notifying of timing for key update by changing a port number.

New claim 97 has both novelty and an inventive step. As mentioned above, new claim 97 corresponds to old claim 36. In the Written Opinion, old claim 36 is recognized to have novelty and an inventive step.

The Written Opinion says that any of the documents does not recite nor suggest updating timing for key update for every HTTP request.

New claim 98 has both novelty and an inventive step. As mentioned above, new claim 98 corresponds to old claim 39. In the Written Opinion, old claim 39 is recognized to have novelty and an inventive step.

The Written Opinion says that any of the documents does not recite nor suggest copy control information of DTCP scheme is transmitted by adding encryption mode information to a reception packet.

From the above reasons, all of new claims 52 through 98 should be recognized to have novelty and an inventive step.

Further, as in the First Written Opinion, new claims 52 through 98 should be recognized to also have industrial applicability.

AMENDMENTS

(Amendment under Section 11 of the Japanese Law Concerning International Applications, Etc. Pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

To: Commissioner of the Patent Office

- Identification of International Application PCT/JP03/13218
- 2. Applicant

Name: MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.

Address: 1006, Oaza Kadoma, Kadoma-shi,

Osaka 571-8501 Japan

Country of nationality: Japan

Country of residence: Japan

3. Agent

Name: (7828) YAMAMOTO Shusaku

Address: Fifteenth Floor, Crystal Tower, 2-27, Shiromi

1-chome, Chuo-ku, Osaka-shi,

Osaka-shi 540-6015 Japan

- 4. Item to be Amended Claims
- Subject Matter of Amendment As per the attached sheets
- 1. Pending claims 1 through 51 are cancelled and new claims 52 through 98 are added.

Best Available Copy

6. List of Attached Documents:

1. "Claims" page 77, page 78, page 79, page 80, page 81, page 82, page 83, page 84, page 85, page 86, page 87, page 88, page 88/1, page 88/2, page 88/3, page 88/4, page 88/5, and page 88/6

Best Available Copy